BR

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN <u>PISTRICT OF ILLINOIS</u>, EASTERN DIVISION.

NOTICE OF APPEAL. NOTICE OF APPEAL. NOTICE OF APPEAL. 2009 JAN -4 PM 5: 14

DR. RABBI K. A. ISRAEL, CONSULAR ATTY-QLERY
BROTHER OF, AND THE GUARDIAN FOR, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
MS. BEATRICE DEMETRICE GARTH,
P.O. BOX 803241,
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, 60680-3241
TELE.#: (773)-469-8132

COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS
OF 42 U.S.C. ss 1983, AND
A.B.A. MODEL RULES OF
PROF. CONDUCT, RULE(S):
3.7(a); MIS-APPROPRIATION

PLAINTIFF.

<u>VERSUS</u>

THOMAS M. LAKE, ATTORNEY AT LAW, 100 EAST COOK AVENUE, 2ND. FLOOR, LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS, 60048
TELE. #: (847)-362-5385

DEFENDANT,

AND THE INSURERS OF
THOMAS MARTIN LAKE, ATTORNEY AT LAW,
30 NO. LASALLE STREET, SUITE 2800,
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, 60602
TELEPHONE: (312)-263-6300

FILED

JAN 0 7 2008

MICHAEL W. DOBBINS CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED UNDER, AND PURSUANT TO, F.R.C.P. (38): JURY TRIAL OF RIGHT; (a), (b), (c) AND F.R.C.P. (40): ASSIGNMENT OF CASES FOR TRIAL, AND THE SEVENTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ET AL..

1-2 MAL 8005: A PARTICIO PARTICIO PARTICIO PARTICIO PARTICIO PARTICIO PARTICIO PER 1 - NAL 8005 : A PARTICIO P COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS

COUNT
OF 42 U.S.C. SS 1983, AND
A.B.A. MODEL RULES OF
PROF. CONDUCT, RULE(S):
3.7(a); MIS-APPROPRIATION,
TITLE 42; SCHAPTER (21),
SUBCH.((1), SS 1985;
PARA. (2): OBSTRUCTING
JUSTICE, AND INTIMIDATING
PARTY AND WITNESS, ET AL.,
SUPL COURT OF ILL. RULES
OF PROF. CONDUCT:
RULE 8.4; MISCONDUCT:
8.4(a)(1), (a)(2), (a)(3),
(a)(4), (a)(5), (9)(A)ET AL.

CIVIL ACTION NO.: 07cv 6609

HON. JUDGE: JUDGE JOAN H. LEF

MAGISTRATE JUDGE MAS

DAMAGES CLAIMED: \$2,777,000.0
TWO-MILLION-SEVEN-HUNDRED
AND SEVENTY+SEVEN
THOUSAND DOLLARS;
U.S. CURRENCY.

DISTRICT COURT JURISDICTION:

28 U.S.C. ss 1343(a)(1),

(a)(2), (a)(3), (a)(4);

CIVIL RIGHTS & ELECTIVE

FRANCHISE,

ARTICLE (III): ss (1) & (2),

ARTICLE (IV) ss (1) & (2),
ARTICLE (IV) ss (1) & (2),
ART. (VI): PARA. (2) & (3),
AND AMENDMENT(S) (I), (IV),
(V), (VI), (VII), (VIII),
(IX), (X), (XIV): ss (1),
& (XV) OF THE U.S. CONST.,
& 28 U.S.C. ss 1331,
VENUE: 28 U.S.C. ss 1391a-c.

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	Joan H. Lefkow	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	
CASE NUMBER	07 C 6609	DATE	12/5/2007
CASE TITLE	***************************************	, , , <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

Order Formi (01/2005)

Plaintiff's complaint is dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis [4], "Plaintiff's Motion to Correct Clerical Mistakes..." [5], and "Plaintiff's Motion to Authorize the Notice of Lawsuit..." [6] are denied. Noticed motion date of 12/11/2007 is stricken and case will not be called in court on 12/11/2007. Civil Case Terminated.

[For further details see text below.]

Mailed AO 450 form. Notices mailed by Judicial staff.

STATEMENT

Plaintiff, Rabbi K.A. Israel ("Israel"), has presented for filing a complaint, as well as:

(1) an in forma pauperis application,

(2) "Plaintiff's Motion to Correct Clerical Mistakes in the Court's Docket in Accordance with the Original 'Case-Caption' and 'Civil-Coversheet' Under, and Pursuant to F.R.C.P. 60(a); Clerical Mistakes," and (3) "Plaintiff's Motion to Authorize the Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service of Summonses, Upon the Defendants Under, and Pursuant to, F.R.C.P. (1.) Through F.R.C.P. 4(n)(2) Through F.R.C.P. 86(e)."

In assessing any complaint, the court must first decide whether it has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the law suit. See Cook v. Winfrey 141 F.3d 322, 325 (7th Cir.1998) ("The requirement that jurisdiction be established as a threshold matter springs from the nature and limits of the judicial power of the United States and is inflexible and without exception.") (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

As best this court can determine, plaintiff appears to be alleging a malpractice action against Thomas M. Lake, an attorney appointed by Judge Castillo to represent Israel in a separate civil action filed by Israel in this district (*Israel v. Burnham Health-Properties Facility*, 07 CV 4702 (N.D. Ill.) (complaint filed Aug. 20, 2007)). Israel alleges that Lake:

- (a) said he was unfamiliar with practicing law in the federal courts,
- (b) made false and misleading statements about his services;
- (c) created unjustified expectations about the results that Israel could expect him to achieve;
- (d) was disingenuous and deceitful in certain statements that Lake made to the Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission in response to a complaint filed by Israel;
- (e) induced others to engage in conduct that Lake knew was in violation of the attorney rules of professional conduct;
- (f) committed criminal acts that reflect adversely on Lake's honesty, trustworthiness, and fitness to practice as an attorney;

STATEMENT

(g) engaged in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;

(h) engaged in discriminatory treatment of Israel on the basis of ethnicity, race, gender, theology, national origin, disability, age, and socioeconomic status, conduct which reflects adversely on the defendant's fitness as an attorney;

(I) misrepresented during a probate guardianship hearing that Lake was the legal counsel for Israel after Israel had terminated his attorney-client relationship with Lake;

(j) failed to put sufficient effort or work into Israel's case before Judge Castillo;

(k) remained involved in Israel's legal matters after Lake was no longer authorized to represent Israel;

(I) failed to return certain original documents that Israel had provided to him; and

(m) failed to disclose to Israel the names of the people to whom Lake divulged privileged information regarding Israel.

Israel cites a number of federal and state laws in the first four pages of the complaint, including 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1982, 1983, 1985 (civil rights statutes); 15 U.S.C. § 13(a)-(b) (the Robinson-Patman Act, an antitrust statute); the Supreme Court of Illinois's Rules of Professional Conduct; 28 U.S.C. §§ 1343, 1357 (jurisdictional statutes concerning federal civil rights suits); 15 U.S.C. § 15 (a damages statute concerning federal antitrust actions); and Articles III, IV and VI, and Amendments I, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X, XIII, and XIV of the United States Constitution. In spite of the numerous federal statutes he cites, Israel does not appear to allege conduct that presents a question arising under the Constitution or laws of the United States over which this court could assume jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331. Rather, it appears to be a straightforward legal malpractice action between citizens of Illinois, which is generally not cognizable under federal law. See, e.g., Wallin v. Arapahoe County Detention Facility, 2007 WL 2153224, at *3 (10th Cir. July 27, 2007) (noting that "a legal malpractice claim is a state-law tort claim, not a § 1983 claim"); see also Polk County v. Dodson, 454 U.S. 312, 325, 102 S. Ct. 445, 70 L. Ed. 2d 509 (1981) (holding that "a public defender does not act under color of state law when performing a lawyer's traditional functions as counsel to a defendant in a criminal proceeding"). In order for this court to assume jurisdiction over a non-federal claim, plaintiff must demonstrate, among other things, that the matter is between citizens of different States. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1). Unless plaintiff can allege such diversity of citizenship as well as more than \$75,000 in controversy, there could be no federal jurisdiction even if leave to amend were granted. The court thus dismisses this case, although without prejudice to plaintiff's filing a complaint with an appropriate Illinois court. Plaintiff's pending motions are denied.

United States District Court Northern District of Illinois

Eastern Division

Israel		JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE							
	v.	Case Number: 07 C 6609							
Lake		· .							
	Jury Verdict. This action came be tried and the jury rendered its ver	efore the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been dict.							
		on by Court. This action came to trial or hearing before the Court. The issues been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.							
	HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJU	JDGED that this case is dismissed for lack of subject							
		Michael W. Dobbins, Clerk of Court							
Date:	12/5/2007								
	•	/s/ Michael Dooley, Deputy Clerk							

MAGISTRATE JUDGE MASON

(a) PLAINTIFFS DR. RABBI K. A. ISRAEL.

CIVIL COVER SHEET



DEFENDANTS : THOMAS MARTIN LAKE,

The civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

THE BROTHER OF, AND GUARDIAN FOR, MS. BEATRICE DEMETRICE GARTH,			ATTORNEY AT LAW, AND THE INSURERS OF THOMAS M. LAKE,						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff COUNTY OF COOK, (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) 7 C 6 6 9			County of Residence of First Listed Defendant COUNTY OF COOK (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.						
PARALEGALS FOI	e, Address, and Telephone Number) R CIVIL RIGHTS & HUMAN	4	Attorneys (if Kno	own) EL: JOHN M. B	URKE,				
RIGHTS, INTERNATIONALE, II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only) III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff									
II. BASIS OF JUNION	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		versity Cases Only)		and One Box for Dafandant)				
☐ 1 U.S. Government XXXX3 Federal Question Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a Party)		Citizen	Citizen of This State XXX BX Incorporated or Principal Place 4 of Business in This State						
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen	of Another State □	2 🗆 2 Incorporated and of Business In	d Principal Place D 5 D 5 Another State				
-	ж ами 1237		or Subject of a D	3 🗓 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6				
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)								
CONTRACT	TORTS		eiture/penalty		OTHER STATUTES				
V. ORIGIN DEXI Original □ 2 R	******		ated or 🗆 5 anothi	PROFERTY RIGHTS D 220 Copyrights 230 Painnt 240 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY 261 HIA (1395ff) 262 Black Lung (923) 263 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 264 SSID This XVI 265 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS 0 270 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Dafandard) 271 1R5—Third Party 26 USC 7609					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI			rite VII. PREV	IOUS BANKRUPTCY	MATTERS (For nature of				
g brief statement of cause.) suit 422 and 423, enter the case number and judge for any associated									
TITLE 15 CHAP. (1), as (13)(a), (13)(b), separate attachment if necessary) & ss (15)(a), ET AL., DISCRIMIN. IN SERV.									
VIII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	() CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTI UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		MANDS 2,777,000		If demanded in complaint: XXD Yes D No				
IX. This case XXXX	is not a refiling of a previously dismissed acti	* *			57				
DATE SIGNATURE OF/AFTORNEY OF RECORD									
NOVEMBER 26, 2007) R. Rahly K. A. Jarael.									